

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the above amendments and the remarks set forth below. Claims 1-20 remain in the application. Claims 1, 5, 12, 14, 17 and 18 are amended. Claims 2-4, 6-11, 13, 15, 16, 19 and 20 remain unchanged.

35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 5 and 12 are amended to overcome the rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 14, 15, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Pacey et al. (3,744,322). Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), for a reference to anticipate a claimed invention, each and every element of the claim must be found in the reference.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a “vibratory rotational rate sensor comprising...a vibratory element including a pair of vibratory masses disposed symmetrically along a common axis for vibration along the axis...a driver coupled to only one of the vibratory masses for inducing periodic motion in the pair of vibratory masses along the axis...a first sense circuit coupled to at least one of the vibratory masses for sensing motion of the vibratory mass in one direction orthogonal to the vibratory axis... and a second sense circuit coupled to at least one of the vibratory masses for sensing motion of the vibratory mass in another direction orthogonal to the vibratory axis.” (Emphasis added). Support for the amendment to claim 1 is at least provided in applicants’ specification on page 5, lines 12-26.

In contrast to amended claim 1, Pacey appears to be direct towards an angular velocity sensor having two proof masses (15, 17) driven by multiple driver elements (11, 12, 13, 14). (FIGs. 2 and 7; Column 2, lines 16 to 24; and Column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 10). Pacey

does not show the “driver coupled to only one of the vibratory masses for inducing periodic motion in the pair of vibratory masses along the axis” element of amended claim 1. Since amended claim 1 contains elements not found in Pacey, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection for anticipation is overcome.

Claims 2, 4 and 6 depend from amended claim 1 or depend from claims depending from amended claim 1, and should therefore also be allowable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional recitation contained therein. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the above remarks.

Independent claim 14 is amended to include elements similar to the elements of amended independent claim 1 and should therefore be allowable for the same reasons discussed above as well as for the additional recitations contained therein. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection for anticipation is overcome.

Claims 15, 17 and 19 depend from amended claim 14 or depend from claims depending from amended claim 14, and should therefore also be allowable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional recitation contained therein. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the above remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 14, 15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Peters (4,512,192). Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), for a reference to anticipate a claimed invention, each and every element of the claim must be found in the reference.

As discussed above, amended claim 1 recites, inter alia, a “vibratory rotational rate sensor comprising...a vibratory element including a pair of vibratory masses disposed symmetrically along a common axis for vibration along the axis...a driver coupled to only one of the vibratory masses for inducing periodic motion in the pair of vibratory masses along the axis...a first sense circuit coupled to at least one of the vibratory masses for sensing motion of

the vibratory mass in one direction orthogonal to the vibratory axis... and a second sense circuit coupled to at least one of the vibratory masses for sensing motion of the vibratory mass in another direction orthogonal to the vibratory axis.” (Emphasis added).

In contrast to amended claim 1, Peters appears to be direct towards a two axis angular rate and specific force sensor using vibrating accelerometers (10, 12) that are connected to the outer faces of two prongs (20a, 20b) of a tuning fork (20). The accelerometers (10, 12) appear to be vibrated on the tuning fork (20) by two magnets (26, 30) and two drive coils (28, 32). (FIG. 2; Column 3, lines 43 to 63). Peters does not show the “driver coupled to only one of the vibratory masses for inducing periodic motion in the pair of vibratory masses along the axis” element of amended claim 1. Since amended claim 1 contains elements not found in Peters, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection for anticipation is overcome.

Claims 2 and 6 depend from amended claim 1 or depend from claims depending from amended claim 1, and should therefore also be allowable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional recitation contained therein. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the above remarks.

Independent claim 14 is amended to include elements similar to the elements of amended independent claim 1 and should therefore be allowable for the same reasons discussed above as well as for the additional recitations contained therein. Therefore, it is respectfully proposed that the rejection for anticipation is overcome.

Claims 15 and 19 depend from amended claim 14 or depend from claims depending from amended claim 14, and should therefore also be allowable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional recitation contained therein. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the above remarks.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 7, 12, 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters. Claims 3, 7 and 12 depend from amended claim 1 or depend from claims depending from amended claim 1, and should therefore also be allowable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional recitation contained therein. Claims 16 and 20 depend from amended claim 14 or depend from claims depending from amended claim 14, and should therefore also be allowable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional recitation contained therein. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the above remarks.

Claims 8-11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters and further in view of Lutz (5,604,312). Claims 8-11 and 13 depend from amended claim 1 or depend from claims depending from amended claim 1, and should therefore also be allowable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional recitation contained therein. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the above remarks.

Claims 5 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over either Pacey et al. or Peters and further in view of Varnham et al. (5,226,321). Claim 5 depends from amended claim 1 or depends from claims depending from amended claim 1, and should therefore also be allowable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional recitation contained therein. Claims 18 depends from amended claim 14 or depends from claims depending from amended claim 14, and should therefore also be allowable for the same reasons, as well as for the additional recitation contained therein. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of the above remarks.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the

Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at (818) 260-3727, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fees, other than those discussed above, are believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Vincent E. Duffy
Reg. No. 39,964
Phone (818) 260-3727

Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
July 18, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

date

7/18/08



Vincent E. Duffy